

## **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated 23 February 2005 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jailor et al. (4,418,261) in view of Wang (5,988,979).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jailor et al. (4,418,261) as modified by Wang (5,988,979) further in view of Mathis (1,876,518).

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 4 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claims 5-8 have been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-8 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner KERSHTEYN are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: *Charles E. Baxley*

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.